UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,010	07/11/2001	Bruce K. Martin JR.	3399P042	1786

26529 7590 01/12/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN/PDC
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
ANANTHANARAYANAN, RAMYA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,010	MARTIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramya Ananthanarayanan	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-55 have been examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: There are several typographical errors in the specification. Specifically, on line 8 of paragraph 0013, the word "operates" should be "operate". The first sentence of paragraph 0032 is incomplete with the word "and" on line 2 implying another gerund to be included. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 7, 15-17, 27-29, 39-41, 44, 45, 48, 49, 52, and 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McConnell et al. (WO 00/46963).

5. With respect to claims 1 and 39, McConnell et al. disclose a method comprising:

Operating a first provisioning system authorized to provision a processing device on a network (page 13, lines 11-24), wherein the provisioning system is within a trusted environment (Figure 1); and

Using the first provisioning system to authorize a second provisioning system outside the trusted environment (Figure 1) to provision the processing device (page 19, lines 13-25).

6. With respect to claim 2, McConnell et al. disclose the method, wherein said using the first provisioning system to authorize a second provisioning system comprises using the first provisioning system to provision authorization of the second provisioning system in the processing device (page 19, lines 13-25).

7. With respect to claim 3, McConnell et al. disclose the method, wherein said using first provisioning system to authorize a second provisioning system comprises using the first provisioning system to send a provisioning message to the processing device, the provisioning message indicating authorization of the second provisioning system to provision the processing device (page 19, lines 13-25).

8. With respect to claim 4, McConnell et al. disclose the method wherein the provisioning message further specifies one or more parameters which the second provisioning system is authorized to provision (page 19, lines 17-18).

9. With respect to claim 7, McConnell et al. disclose that the processing device is a mobile device on a wireless network (page 8, lines 10-16).

10. With respect to claim 15, McConnell et al. disclose a method comprising:

Operating a primary trusted provisioning domain (TPD) (Figure 1); and

Using the primary TPD to provision a mobile device on a wireless network (page 8, lines 10-16) by sending a provisioning message to the mobile device (page 19, lines 13-25), the provisioning message specifying a secondary TPD authorized to provision the mobile device (page 19, lines 13-25), and an identifier of one or more parameters which the secondary TPD is authorized to provision (page 19, lines 17-18).

11. With respect to claim 27, McConnell et al. disclose a provisioning system comprising:

A processor (page 11, lines 22-24);

A data communications device coupled to the processor to communicate data with one or more remote systems (page 8, lines 24-26); and

A memory (page 8, line 22) coupled to the processor and storing instructions for execution by the processor to cause the provisioning system to provision a mobile device on a wireless network (page 8, lines 10-16) by sending a provisioning message to the mobile device (page 19, lines 13-25), the provisioning message specifying a second provisioning system authorized to provision the mobile device (page 19, lines 13-25) and an identifier of one or more parameters which the second provisioning system is authorized to provision (page 19, lines 17-18).

12. With respect to claim 40, McConnell et al. disclose a method of operating a mobile device on a wireless network, the method comprising:

Receiving a provisioning message from a first trusted provisioning domain (TPD), the provisioning message specifying a second TPD and indicating a parameter which the second TPD is authorized to provision in the mobile device (page 19, lines 24-27);

Storing information identifying the second TPD and the parameter in response to the provisioning message (page 20, lines 2-3); and

Provisioning the parameter in the mobile device in response to a provisioning message from the second TPD (page 20, lines 2-3).

13. With respect to claim 44, McConnell et al. disclose a method of operating a mobile device on a wireless network, the method comprising:

Receiving a provisioning message from a remote source, the provisioning message specifying a parameter (page 19, lines 24-27);

Determining whether the remote source is a primary trusted provisioning domain (TPD) (page 20, lines 5-24);

If the remote source is the primary TPD, provisioning the parameter in the mobile device in response to the provisioning message (page 20, lines 5-24);

If the remote source is not the primary TPD, determining whether the remote source is a secondary TPD authorized to provision the parameter, based on a provisioning authorization previously received by the mobile device from the primary TPD (page 20, lines 5-24); and

If the remote source is a secondary TPD authorized to provision the parameter, provisioning the parameter in the mobile device in response to the provisioning message (page 20, lines 5-24).

14. With respect to claim 48, McConnell et al. disclose a mobile device configured to operate on a wireless network, the mobile device comprising:

A processor (page 8, lines 10-16: It is inherent in mobile devices to have a processor.);

A data communication device coupled to the processor to communicate data with one or more remote systems via the wireless network (page 19, lines 1-2); and

A memory coupled to the processor and storing instructions for execution by the processor to configure the mobile device to execute a process comprising:

Receiving a provisioning message from a first trusted provisioning domain (TPD) via the wireless network, the provisioning message specifying a second TPD and indicating a parameter which the second TPD is authorized to provision in the mobile device (page 19, lines 24-27);

Storing information identifying the second TPD and the parameter in response to the provisioning message (page 20, lines 2-3); and

Provisioning the parameter in the mobile device in response to a provisioning message from the second TPD (page 20, lines 2-3).

15. With respect to claim 52, McConnell et al. disclose a mobile device configured to operate on a wireless network, the mobile device comprising:

A processor (page 8, lines 10-16: It is inherent in mobile devices to have a processor.);

A data communication device coupled to the processor to communicate data with one or more remote systems via the wireless network (page 19, lines 1-2); and

A memory coupled to the processor and storing instructions for execution by the processor to configure the mobile device to execute a process comprising:

Receiving a provisioning message from a remote source, the provisioning message specifying a parameter (page 19, lines 24-27);

Determining whether the remote source is a primary trusted provisioning domain (TPD) (page 20, lines 5-24);

If the remote source is the primary TPD, provisioning the parameter in the mobile device in response to the provisioning message (page 20, lines 5-24);

If the remote source is not the primary TPD, determining whether the remote source is a secondary TPD authorized to provision the parameter, based on a provisioning authorization previously received by the mobile device from the primary TPD (page 20, lines 5-24); and

If the remote source is a secondary TPD authorized to provision the parameter, provisioning the parameter in the mobile device in response to the provisioning message (page 20, lines 5-24).

16. With respect to claims 16, 28, 41, 45, 49, and 53, McConnell et al. disclose the method wherein the primary TPD is within a trusted environment (Figure 1), and wherein the secondary TPD is outside the trusted environment (Figure 1).

17. With respect to claims 17 and 29, McConnell et al. disclose the method wherein the secondary TPD communicates with the mobile device via a second network that is outside the trusted environment (Figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 5, 6, 8–14, 18-26, 30–38, 42, 43, 46, 47, 50, 51, 54, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell et al. in view of Ramasubramanian et al. (U.S. Patent 6,233,577).

20. With respect to claims 5, 19, 23, 31 and 35, McConnell et al. discloses the limitations set forth in claim 1, upon which claim 5 is dependent. McConnell et al. also disclose using the primary provisioning server to specify one or more parameters which the secondary provisioning server is authorized to provision in the mobile devices (page 19, lines 17-18). McConnell et al. do not disclose using the first provisioning system to send a provisioning message to the processing device, the provisioning message indicating authorization of a plurality of other provisioning systems, including the second provisioning system, to provision the processing device. Ramasubramanian et al.

disclose using the first provisioning system to send a provisioning message to the processing device, the provisioning message indicating authorization of a plurality of other provisioning systems, including the second provisioning system, to provision the processing device (column 4, lines 29-40).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. with the teachings of McConnell et al. in order to enable clients to access any secure web sites without demanding additional memory and power (column 8, lines 2-5).

22. With respect to claims 6, 22, 24, 25, 34, 36, and 37, McConnell et al. disclose using the primary provisioning server to specify one or more parameters which the secondary provisioning server is authorized to provision in the mobile devices (page 19, lines 17-18).

23. With respect to claim 8, McConnell et al. discloses the limitations set forth in claim 7, upon which claim 8 is dependent. McConnell et al. do not disclose using a digital signature to provision the mobile device. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose using a digital signature to provision the mobile device (column 4, lines 29-30).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. with the method of

McConnell et al. in order to utilize the most secure use of authentication (column 4, lines 29-30).

25. With respect to claim 9, McConnell et al. do not disclose using the digital signature to authenticate the source of the provisioning message. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose using the digital signature to authenticate the source of the provisioning message (column 4, lines 29-30).

27. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

28. With respect to claim 10, McConnell et al. do not disclose using the first provisioning system to provision the mobile device with a digital certificate identifying the first provisioning system. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose using the first provisioning system to provision the mobile device with a digital certificate identifying the first provisioning system (column 7, lines 10-14).

29. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the McConnell of Smith et al.

30. With respect to claim 11, McConnell et al. do not disclose using the first provisioning system to provision the mobile device with a digital certificate identifying the second provisioning system. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose using the first

provisioning system to provision the mobile device with a digital certificate identifying the second provisioning system (column 7, lines 10-14).

31. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

32. With respect to claim 12, McConnell et al. disclose a method wherein the second provisioning system is on a second network that is outside the trusted environment and separate from, but coupled to, the wireless network (Figure 1).

33. With respect to claims 13, 26, and 38, McConnell et al. do not disclose a method wherein the first provisioning system has unrestricted authorization to provision the mobile device, and the authorization of the second provisioning system to provision the mobile device is regulated from the first provisioning system. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose a method wherein the first provisioning system has unrestricted authorization to provision the mobile device, and the authorization of the second provisioning system to provision the mobile device is regulated from the first provisioning system (column 4, lines 34-42).

34. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

35. With respect to claim 14, McConnell et al. do not disclose using the first provisioning system to provision the mobile device with digital certificates identifying a plurality of other provisioning systems. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose using the first provisioning system to provision the mobile device with digital certificates identifying a plurality of other provisioning systems (column 7, lines 10-14).

36. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

37. With respect to claims 18 and 30, McConnell et al. disclose the limitations set forth in claims 16 and 28, upon which claims 18 and 30 are dependent. McConnell et al. do not disclose using the primary TPD system to provision the mobile device with a digital certificate identifying the secondary TPD to enable the secondary TPD to provision the mobile device using a digital signature. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose using the primary TPD system to provision the mobile device with a digital certificate identifying the secondary TPD to enable the secondary TPD to provision the mobile device using a digital signature (column 7, lines 10-14; column 8, lines 1-5).

38. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

39. With respect to claims 20 and 32, McConnell et al. disclose a method comprising:

Operating a primary provisioning server within a predefined trusted environment (Figure 1);

A secondary provisioning server in the mobile devices, wherein the secondary provisioning server is on a second network outside the trusted environment (Figure 1); and

Using the primary provisioning server to provision the mobile devices with information indicating to the mobile devices authorization of the secondary provisioning server to provision the mobile devices (page 8, lines 10-16; page 19, lines 13-25).

40. McConnell et al. do not disclose a method comprising:

Operating a primary provisioning server having authorization to provision a plurality of mobile devices on a wireless network;

Using the primary provisioning server to provision a digital certificate of the primary provisioning server in each of the mobile devices;

Using the primary provisioning server to provision a digital certificate of a secondary provisioning server in the mobile devices.

Ramasubramanian et al. disclose a method comprising:

Operating a primary provisioning server having authorization to provision a plurality of mobile devices on a wireless network (column 4, lines 29-40);

Using the primary provisioning server to provision a digital certificate of the primary provisioning server in each of the mobile devices (column 7, lines 10-14);

Using the primary provisioning server to provision a digital certificate of a secondary provisioning server in the mobile devices (column 7, lines 10-14).

41. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

42. With respect to claims 21 and 33, McConnell et al. do not disclose a method wherein the primary and secondary provisioning servers each use their respective digital certificates when provisioning the mobile devices, to enable the mobile devices to authenticate provisioning messages from the primary and secondary provisioning servers. Ramasubramanian et al. disclose a method wherein the primary and secondary provisioning servers each use their respective digital certificates when provisioning the mobile devices, to enable the mobile devices to authenticate provisioning messages from the primary and secondary provisioning servers (column 4, lines 29-30).

43. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

44. With respect to claims 42, 46, 50, and 54, McConnell et al. do not disclose a method comprising:

Receiving a digital certificate of the second TPD from the first TPD; and

Using the digital certificate in the mobile device to authenticate the provisioning message from the second TPD.

45. Ramasubramanian discloses a method as recited in claim 41, further comprising:

Receiving a digital certificate of the second TPD from the first TPD; and

Using the digital certificate in the mobile device to authenticate the provisioning message from the second TPD (column 4, lines 29-30).

46. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

47. With respect to claims 43, 47, 51, and 55, McConnell et al. disclose using the primary provisioning server to specify one or more parameters which the secondary provisioning server is authorized to provision in the mobile devices (page 19, lines 17-18). McConnell et al. do not disclose a method wherein the provisioning message specifies a plurality of secondary TPDS, the method further comprising storing information identifying each of the secondary TPDS and the corresponding parameters in response to the provisioning message. Ramasubramanian discloses a method wherein the provisioning message specifies a plurality of secondary TPDS (column 4, lines 29-40), the method further comprising storing information identifying each of the secondary TPDS and the corresponding parameters in response to the provisioning message (column 7, lines 10-32).

48. Please refer above for the motivational benefits with regards to the application of the teachings of Ramasubramanian et al. to the teachings of McConnell et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramya Ananthanarayanan whose telephone number is (571) 272-5860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 -5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RA

AU2131
1/6/05